

United States Patent and Trademark Office

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Bec 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/928,396	08/14/2001	Yoshinobu Izawa	MAR74 001 6305		
7590 11/20/2003			EXAMINER		
DUANE MORRIS LLP			HRUSKOCI, PETER A		
1667 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 700 WASHINGTON,, DC 20006			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1724	<u> </u>	

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)		
		09/928,39	96	IZAWA, YOSHINOBU		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit		
		Peter A. H	ruskoci	1724		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status						
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) f	iled on <u>11 August 2003</u>				
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL.	2b) This action is no	on-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 15-26 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 15-26 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 						
Applicati	on Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. 						
Attachmen			4) Thterview Summary	(PTO-413) Paper No(s)		
2) Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) be of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)		· =	ratent Application (PTO-152)		

Application/Control Number: 09/928,396

Art Unit: 1724

Claims 15-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In claim 15 "is always" and "that is soaked...water", and in claim 18 "multangular"lack clear antecedent basis in the specification as originally filed, and appear to be drawn to new matter. Claims 16-26 depend from the claim 15.

Claims 15-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 15 is considered incomplete because it is essential to the instant apparatus that the separating wall be connected to the interior surface of the tank and divides said tank into a first chamber and a second chamber and in which the separating wall moves within said tank responsive to the water level in the second chamber to control the water level of the first chamber, the tank comprise at least on inlet and one outlet fitted on the second chamber for water level adjustment, and the first chamber be capable of treating the water to form treated water and a sludge. In claim 18 "multangular" and in claim 24 "farther" appear to be erroneous and should be changed to - rectangular— and - further -, respectively. Claims 16-23, 25, and 26 depend from the above claims.

Claim 22 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 21.

When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim

Application/Control Number: 09/928,396

Art Unit: 1724

to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15-17, 20, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 19512315 Schwetje. Schwetje disclose (See Figure) the structure of the apparatus substantially as claimed. The claims differ from Schwetje by reciting that the apparatus comprises at least one airtight tank. It would appear that the structure of the apparatus of Schweje is capable of being air tight, when the volume of water and wastewater in the upper and bottom half of the container close off the respective vents. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the apparatus of Schwetje by including at least one airtight tank, to prevent oxidation of the water. With regard to claim 20, it is submitted that the movement of the plunger 7 of Schwetje would agitate or stirred water in the upper half of the container. The use of a plurality of tanks would have been an obvious matter of engineering design to one skilled in the art, depending on the specific water treated and results desired, absent a sufficient showing of unexpected results.

Claim 15 properly written to overcome the above 35 USC 112 rejections include claims16-18 would be allowable.

Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered but are not deemed pertinent to the above rejections.

Art Unit: 1724

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter A. Hruskoci whose telephone number is 703-308-3839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Blaine Copenheaver can be reached on 703-308-1261. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1724